National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XXV. NO. 5. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 11, 1864. WHOLE NO. 1,256.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY, AT $2 50 PER ANNUM, BY THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, At its Office, No. 48 Beekman Street, New York AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, 106 North-Tenth Street, Philadelphia.

Letters should be addressed to OLIVER JOHNSON Editor Anti-Slavery Standard, 48 Beekman-st., New York.

ADVERTISEMENTS, 10 cents per line each insertion.

Selections.

A BISHOP BASTED.

From Harper's Weekly.

SOMEBODY has written a brief and capital satire upon Bishop Hopkins's Letter defending slavery upon Bible grounds. By substituting the word Polygamy for slavery, the exact value of the Bishop's argument [illegible]. For if slavery be a good thing because [illegible] had slaves, polygamy is equally [illegible] because they had harems. And if slavery be [illegible] because Christ did not verbally condemn it, polygamy must be desirable because He did not even [illegible] at all.

In fact, what is called the Bible argument deserves [illegible] such treatment as the ridicule, the contempt, and the sarcasm which are so delicately dealt it by this squib. If we are to excuse our sins by those of the Jewish patriarchs, and if the whole spirit and tendency of Christ's teaching are to go for naught because He did not chance to specify some offense, there is no absurdity that may not be defended, and no crime that may not be justified.

The slave party treats the Bible exactly as it does the Constitution. The whole meaning and scope are ignored, in order to make a fight upon a doubtful [illegible] phrase. Does Bishop Hopkins seriously wish to see in the United States the polity and [illegible] of the ancient tribes in Judea? Does he propose, since he gives his right hand to Calhoun, to insist upon Brigham Young's taking his left? Solomon was called the wisest of men. Does the Bishop think it logically follows that a man grows in wisdom as he increases his harem, and that perfect wisdom requires a man to have, like Solomon, seven hundred wives and three hundred concubines?

It is just as logical to say that as to say that a man may rightfully buy and sell human beings, and tear children from parents, and wives from husbands, and scourge them to work without wages, and deny them all mental light, and doom them to abject submission to a despotic will, because the old Jews held slaves. Nor can we see the force of the argument which commends slavery to a Christian because Abraham held slaves, and Christ had none. To say that he did not forbid it is to quibble, because verbally he condemned very few sins. Did he condemn burning a neighbor's barn? No: no more than he condemned enslaving him. But he bade us love our neighbor as ourselves; and he told us that all men were our neighbors.

The Bishop of Vermont announces a book in which he proposes to establish the right of slavery from the Bible. Let him be entreated. He is judged in advance. The Eastern criminal did not know until he moved that his head had been sliced off, so smoothly had the sharp sword cut it. Does the good Bishop not know that he has been taken upon a toasting-fork and scorched at the fire of common-sense?

[We annex the letter above referred to, from the Burlington (Vt.) *Times*.—ED. STANDARD.]

BIBLE VIEW OF POLYGAMY.

To the Right Reverend John Henry Hopkins, Bishop of the Diocese of Vermont.

RIGHT REVEREND SIR: I venture to dedicate to you these few pages, which derive their inspiration from your writings. An admirer, like yourself, of the institutions of old, I should hardly have dared to declare these truths to a perverse and self-glorifying generation, had I not been emboldened by the example of one who so worthily wears the highest honors of the Church. In constructing my argument, therefore, as I have done, with paragraph after paragraph of your very words, it has been because I felt it necessary to shield myself behind your authority from the charge which ignorant presumption might else have brought, of irreverently travestying the Word of God. A practice which can stigmatize as "twin relics of barbarism" two institutions such as slavery and polygamy, which are divinely sanctioned if not divinely ordained, is capable of any act of irreligious fanaticism. The Utah expedition failed to accomplish the destruction of the one; let us hope that the present abolition war may prove equally unsuccessful as to the other. To aid in the good work, then, let us lend our united energies to the task of forcing the light of truth through the accumulated darkness of our so-called modern civilization, in the hope that the time is not far distant when every citizen may have as many slaves as Abraham, and as many wives as Solomon.

Trusting that you will accept my coöperation in the spirit in which it is tendered, I beg leave to subscribe myself Your humble admirer, MIZPAH.

Polygamy may be defined as the union for life of a man with two or more women. And this kind of union appears to have existed as an established institution in all the ages of our world, by the universal evidence of all history, whether sacred or profane.

This understood, I shall not oppose the prevalent idea that polygamy is an evil in itself. A *physical* evil it may be; but this does not satisfy the judgment of its more zealous adversaries, since they contend that it is a *moral* evil—a positive *sin* in a man to be married simultaneously to more than one woman.

Here, therefore, lies the true aspect of the controversy. And it is evident that it can only be settled by the Bible. For every Christian is bound to assent to the rule of the inspired Apostle, that "sin is the transgression of the law," namely, the law laid down in the Scriptures by the authority of God—the supreme "Lawgiver who is able to save and to destroy." From his Word there can be no appeal. No rebel can be so atrocious in his sight as that which dares to rise against his government. No blasphemy can be more unpardonable than that which imputes sin or moral evil to the decrees of the eternal Judge, who is alone perfect in wisdom, in knowledge and in love.

If it were a matter to be determined by my personal sympathies, I should be as ready as any man to condemn the institution of polygamy, for all my [illegible] are [illegible] and social [illegible] opposed to it. But as a Christian, I am solemnly warned not to be "wise in my own conceit," and not "to lean to my own understanding." As a Christian, I am compelled to submit my [illegible] and [illegible] I [illegible] safe in my convictions, when I know that they are in accordance with the will of [illegible], before whose tribunal I must render a strict account at the last great day.

I proceed, accordingly, to the evidence of the sacred Scriptures, which [illegible], and must, as I regard it, be conclusive to every candid and sincere [illegible].

The first appearance of polygamy in the [illegible] is [illegible] Lamech [illegible] whose two wives Adah and Zillah [illegible] v. 19—[illegible] inspired writer without any expression of [illegible] or any allusion to [illegible] being unusual or irregular. [illegible] as a matter to be regarded as among the [illegible] though [illegible] to enable [illegible] its extent and practice [illegible] however that the great duration [illegible] caused [illegible] for [illegible] more than one [illegible] temper might render distasteful a few [illegible].

[illegible] generations after the Deluge [illegible]. Apparently the first who revived [illegible] appears to have been Esau [illegible] from his [illegible] nature [illegible] character. He seems to have connected himself with three wives, Judith, Bashemath and [illegible] (Gen. xxvi. 34; xxviii. 9; xxxvi. 2, 3.) [illegible] the descendants of Cain and Esau however, be regarded as somewhat questionable sponsors for the [illegible], all doubt as to its righteousness is removed [illegible] the example of the patriarch Jacob, the blessed of Heaven. His union with Leah and Rachel is well known, as well as the amiable way with which his wives supplied him with supplementary consorts in the persons of their handmaidens, Bilhah and Zilpah (Gen. xxix. xxx.), while the blessings subsequently promised to him and to his posterity show that his plurality of wives was sanctioned in the highest and most direct manner.

Polygamy being thus divinely approved, it became a recognized part of the domestic economy of the chosen people, as we learn from the direct rule established by the wisdom of God for Israel, on the very point in question.

"If a man have two wives, one beloved, and another hated, and they have borne him children, both the beloved and the hated; and if the first-born son be hers that was hated;

"Then shall it be when he maketh his sons to inherit that which he hath, that he shall not make the son of the beloved first-born before the son of the hated, which is indeed the first-born."—*Deut.* xxi. 15–17.

With this law before his eyes, what Christian can believe that the Almighty attached immorality or sin to the condition of polygamy, especially when one may look in vain through the Mosaic regulations of marriage (*Levit.* xviii.) for any limitation on the number of wives?

The blessing vouchsafed to those who took to themselves numerous consorts, and the lofty positions to which they arose show that in the eyes of God and man they were pure from sin and worthy of all honor.

It is recorded of two judges of Israel, Ibzan and Abdon, that the one had thirty sons and thirty daughters, while the other had forty sons, showing conclusively that their gynecea were abundantly peopled. (*Judges* xii. 9, 13.) That the Prophet Samuel—the asked of God—sprang from a father, Elkanah the Levite, who had two wives (I. *Samuel* i.), is sufficient proof to those who impiously use the word bigamist as a term of contumely and reproach.

David, the man after God's own heart, before he was thirty-seven years of age, had taken to wife Michal, Ahinoam, Abigail, Maacah, Haggith, Abital and Eglah (II. *Samuel* iii.); while he was living with them all, God prospered him and made him king over Israel and Judah, and the prophet Nathan announced to him the favor of the Lord, to him and his generation. Even his indiscretion in adding Bathsheba to the list was readily pardoned, and the Union was blessed in the birth of Solomon.

Solomon, wisest of men, "had seven hundred wives princesses, and three hundred concubines." (I. *Kings* xi. 3.) In this he sacrificed himself to the vindication of the great principle of polygamy, for the tempter easily found admittance among such a multitude and seduced him to follow strange gods—a warning to us all to be moderate, even in what is right.

Such, then, is the institution of polygamy, laid down by the Lord God of Israel for his chosen people, and continued for fifteen centuries, until the new dispensation of the Gospel. What change did this produce? I grant, of course, that we, as Christians, are bound by the precept and example of the Savior and his apostles. Let us now, therefore, proceed to the all-important inquiry, whether we are authorized by these to presume that the Mosaic system was done away.

First, then, we ask what the divine Redeemer said in reference to polygamy. And the answer is perfectly undeniable: HE DID NOT ALLUDE TO IT AT ALL. Not one word upon the subject is recorded by any of the four Evangelists who gave His life and doctrines to the world, even when He repealed the Mosaic law of divorce. (*Matt.* xix., *Mark* x.) Yet polygamy was in full existence at the time throughout Judea, and among the scattered Jews for centuries later, as we learn from Justin Martyr. (*Dial. cum Tryphone adv. Judæos*) and Theophylact (*Comment. in I. Epist. ad Timoth*). Even as late as 393, Theodosius the Great, in his ignorant zeal, endeavored to put an end to it, by a law which was continued in force by Justinian in the sixth century. (*Const.* 7 *Cod, Lib.* I. *Tit.* ix.) How prosperous would be the present and how glorious the future of Utah, if the eloquent and pertinacious declaimers against polygamy had been willing to follow their Saviour's example!

But did not our Lord substantially repeal the old law by the mere fact that he established a new dispensation? Certainly not, unless they were incompatible. And, that he did not consider them incompatible is clearly proved by his own express declaration. "Think not," saith he, "that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets. I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." (*Mat.* v. 17.) On that point, therefore, this single passage is perfectly conclusive.

But the precepts and the conduct of St. Paul himself, the great Apostle of the Gentiles, are all-sufficient, because he meets the very point, and settles the whole question. Not only do his admonitions concerning marriage (I. *Corinth.* vii.) contain no prohibition of polygamy, but in his directions concerning the choice of bishops, priests and deacons (I. *Tim.* iii. 2–12; *Tit.* i. 6,) he specially requires them to be men of one wife, thus tacitly, but fully, allowing a plurality of consorts to the laity of the faithful.

The evidence of the New Testament is thus complete, plainly proving that the institution of polygamy was not abolished by the Gospel. Compare now the course of the ultra reformer with that of Christ and his inspired apostle. The divine Redeemer openly rebukes the sanctimonious Pharisees. He spares not the infidel Sadducees. He denounces the hypocritical Scribes. He calls the royal Herod "that fox." He censures severely the Jewish practice of divorcing their wives for the slightest cause. He makes a scourge of small cords and drives the buyers and sellers out of the temple. Yet he lived in the [illegible] of polygamy, maintained in accordance with the Mosaic law, and uttered no one word against it. What proof can be stronger than this, that he did not regard it as a sin or a moral evil? And what contrast can be more manifest than this [illegible] Christ on the one hand, and [illegible] denunciations of our anti-polygamy [illegible] politicians, *calling themselves* [illegible]? For they not only set themselves against the Word of God in this matter [illegible] to say [illegible] in the very name of [illegible] whose [illegible] of conduct was the [illegible].

Yet I do not mean [illegible] respectable friends of [illegible] ful or conscious [illegible] seduced, [illegible] by the feelings of a [illegible], which [illegible], if it does not [illegible] dangerous [illegible] far away [illegible] with no [illegible] of the institution [illegible] to attach an [illegible] the domestic [illegible] to compassionate [illegible] they must be [illegible] sion of a husband's [illegible] special inducement to [illegible] particular subject nor are they [illegible] ry to say [illegible] as they read the newspaper, the novel and the magazine.

[illegible] mistaken [illegible] the [illegible] planet [illegible] has disfigured our statute-books with [illegible] a [illegible] upon this patriarchal institution [illegible] Christian [illegible] in our midst, [illegible] of the hallowed days of old, are [illegible] them covertly and under the [illegible] against are tracked and persecuted as [illegible] martyred like the primitive Christians [illegible] Diocletian. When some [illegible] on the banks of the Mississippi a [illegible] when they [illegible] generation [illegible] by an [illegible] of fanaticism. [illegible] martyrs [illegible] at length [illegible] and their posterity [illegible] the persecution [illegible] and the whole nation, as [illegible] twenty [illegible] forth [illegible].

[illegible] shall we [illegible] that we are wiser [illegible] than the men who walked with God? Is it not time that we should confess our worldly wisdom to be ignorance, and turn with simple faith to the law that [illegible] written [illegible] Abolitionist [illegible] and [illegible], let us imitate the noble [illegible] brethren who are ready to [illegible] that the world holds dear in defence of patriarchal institutions. [illegible] principles ordained and sanctioned in the Book of Books, we may hope to see arise amongst us new Jacobs and Samuels, Davids and Solomons.

VALUE OF SLAVES IN MARYLAND.—Everything goes up now-a-days, but negro property, which runs down as fast as gold runs up at Richmond. The following [illegible] advertisement, which we find in a Maryland county paper, though smacking of sour grapes, tells a fearful tale of depreciation:

"One dollar is a reward suitable [illegible] offer for a [illegible] negro, who ran off on Sunday at 4 o'clock p.m. [illegible] an old black witch of seventy-five or eighty. Sukey, a cripple, who can move only with a stick, aged seventy. Sidney, a helpless boy of three. Elsie, a woman of twenty-six with an infant; and Dick, an intelligent [illegible] husband, fourteen years of age. Information of the above may be addressed to the subscriber."

Only one dollar for six slaves—four of them worth in former times, not less than two thousand five hundred. This is what secession has brought upon the slaveholders of Maryland. We believe that they will be better off for the loss, but they do not and they must thank their Southern friends for the good or ill of losing their slaves. It was not the election of Mr. Lincoln, but the attempt to resist that election by rebellion and war, which destroyed slavery. After that election, and before the rebellion broke out, the above described slaves would have sold at high prices.—*Washington Chronicle.*

CONSEQUENCES OF THE FUGITIVE SLAVE ACT.

AND, first, as to its consequences. In the history of the African race these can never be forgotten. Since the first authorization of the slave trade nothing so terrible had fallen upon this unhappy people, whether we contemplate its [illegible] to individuals or the wide-spread [illegible] which it launched against all who were guilty of a skin not colored as our own.

It is sad to know of suffering anywhere, even by a single lowly person. But our feelings are enhanced when [illegible] sorrows are [illegible] and the [illegible] upon a whole race. History [illegible] takes [illegible]. The Jews expelled from Spain by [illegible], the Huguenots driven from France by the revocation of the edict of Nantes; our own Puritan fathers [illegible] fled to exile for religious freedom; all these [illegible] a [illegible] sympathy and we detest [illegible]. These were [illegible] religion in days of religious bigotry and darkness. But an American Congress in the [illegible] of Christian light, and in the [illegible] of [illegible] but in the [illegible] of slavery, did an act which [illegible] comparison only with these enormities of the past. The Fugitive Slave Act carried dismay and terror to every person of African blood in the free States. All were flattered, as the arbitrary edict [illegible] its swoop over the land. The very [illegible] that a slave-hunter was [illegible] so shook the [illegible] a sensitive freeman, in whom was the [illegible] of color that he died. To large numbers this act was a decree of instantaneous expulsion from the Republic, under the penalties of slavery to them and their heirs forever. Stung with despair as many as 6,000 Christian men and women, meritorious persons—a larger band than that of the escaping Puritans—precipitately fled from homes which they had established, opportunities of usefulness which they had found, and the regard of fellow-citizens, until at last, in an unwelcome Northern climate, beneath the British flag, with glad voices of freedom on their lips, though with the yearnings of exile in their hearts, they were happy in swelling the chant, "God save the Queen."

But such an injustice cannot be restrained in its influence. Wherever it shows itself it is an extension of slavery with all the wrong, violence, and brutality which are the natural outgrowth of slavery. The free States became little better than a huge outlying plantation, quivering under the lash of the overseer; or, rather, they were a diversified hunting-ground for the flying bondman, resounding always with the "halloo" of the huntsman. There seemed to be no rest. The chase was hardly finished at Boston, before it broke out at Philadelphia, Syracuse, or Buffalo, and then again raged furiously over the prairies of the West. Not a case occurred which did not shock the conscience of the country, and sting it with anger. The records of the time attest the accuracy of this statement. Perhaps there is no instance in history where human passion showed itself in grander forms of expression, or where eloquence lent all her gifts more completely to the demands of liberty, than the speech of an eminent character now dead and buried in a foreign land, denouncing the capture of Thomas Sims, at Boston, and invoking the judgment of God and man upon the agents in this wickedness. That great effort cannot be forgotten in the history of humanity. But every case pleaded with an eloquence of its own, until at last one of those tragedies occurred which darken the heavens and cry out with a voice that will be heard. It was the voice of a mother standing over her murdered child. Margaret Garner had escaped from slavery with three children, but she was overtaken at Cincinnati. Unwilling to see her offspring returned to the shambles of the South, this unhappy person, described in the testimony as "a womanly, amiable, affectionate mother," determined to save them in the only way within her power. With a butcher-knife, coolly and deliberately, she took the life of one of the children, described as "almost white, and a little girl of rare beauty," and attempted, without success, to take the life of the other two. To the preacher who interrogated her, she exclaimed: "The child was [illegible] own, given me of God to do the best a mother [illegible] in its behalf. I have done the best I could [illegible] have done more and better [illegible] was better for them to go [illegible] slavery." But she was [illegible] The Fugitive Slave Act [illegible] termination of sundry [illegible], his devoted [illegible] children that remained [illegible] of the little one [illegible] a national guard [illegible] the doom of slavery. But her case [illegible] this revolting sacrifice. So long as [illegible] is moved by human suffering, the [illegible] this mother will be read with alternate anger and grief, while it is studied as a perpetual witness to the slaveholding tyranny which then ruled the Republic with execrable exactions, destined at last to break out in war, as the sacrifice of Virginia by her father is a perpetual witness to the decemviral tyranny which ruled Rome.—*From Mr. Sumner's Report to the Senate.*

THE ARGUELLES CASE.

From The N. Y. Times.

THE Copperhead press, true to their instincts, have done their best to make party capital from the arrest of Arguelles in this City, and his deportation to Cuba to take his trial as a slave-trader. Their point is, that there is no extradition treaty between the United States and Spain, and that, therefore, the giving up of Arguelles was neither necessary nor legal. They are perfectly welcome to this issue with the Administration, and we hope they will continue to press it with all their natural virulence.

There is no extradition treaty between the United States and Spain, nor, in a case like this, need there be. The crime charged is slave-trading, which by the law of nations, as well as our own laws, is piracy. A pirate, in the view of universal law, is the enemy of the human race: and the human race, without regard to national distinctions, are everywhere interested in cutting short his career and bringing him to punishment. The United States and Great Britain are specially obligated to do so, because in the memorable Ashburton Treaty they covenanted with each other to maintain squadrons on the coast of Africa—by [illegible], on the coast of Cuba likewise—[illegible] the suppression of the slave trade, and also to urge upon all nations the propriety and duty of closing all markets for the sale of slaves. Remonstrances have accordingly been made with Spain in past years against the facilities for landing slaves in Cuba, the chief slave market. These remonstrances [illegible] have [illegible] inasmuch as Spain has derived [illegible] largely from Cuba [illegible] had [illegible] the slave trade [illegible] every Captain-General who for his own [illegible] carry out effectively [illegible] laws against the trade. The present Captain-General, Dulce, is unlike his predecessors, and is, in good faith laboring to enforce these laws. He has been so successful that last year he diminished the number of imported slaves about four thousand. He desires the [illegible] of our government in his work, and [illegible] asked it to surrender for trial in Havana [illegible] Arguelles, who, he shows by conclusive evidence [illegible] hundred and forty-one of one thousand [illegible] negroes, landed in the neighborhood of Cardenas, last November, and who directly afterward sought [illegible] in New York. The President, after examining the case, caused Arguelles to be arrested and sent to Havana, where he will doubtless be convicted and sentenced to the chain-gang, which he deserves. The crime of Arguelles is the more heinous, because he perpetrated it as a public official, ostensibly opposed to the slave trade. The care of the thousand Africans had been committed to him. He returned the one hundred and forty-one as dead who, it has since been discovered, did not die, but had been sold by him for his own profit. These hundred and forty-one are still in bondage, but the facts which will be judicially established on Arguelles's trial will identify them and secure their liberation.

Thus stands the case. The Copperheads are in a rage because one of the most unmitigated scoundrels on the face of the earth is to be arraigned before a legal tribunal, thereby securing his punishment, and redress to his victims. They do not pretend that Arguelles can be tried in New York, for not only are all witnesses absent, but the offence was committed in a foreign jurisdiction. What they claim is simply that he should have [illegible]. In other words that American soil should be a sanctuary for all pirates who commit their deeds within limits to which our ordinary extradition regulations have not yet been [illegible] by regular treaty.

What opinion must the Copperheads have of the moral sense of the American people, in supposing that political capital can be made of the prompt action of the President [illegible] criminal villain [illegible] legal tribunal [illegible] executive act has Abraham Lincoln [illegible] in his high office, and [illegible] may be more [illegible] upon the [illegible] approval of all [illegible]. Our [illegible] was never [illegible] pirates. To make any such [illegible] is to insult the American name. It is a [illegible] same spirit [illegible] nation [illegible].

WHY A SOUTHERN BORN MAN IS ANTI-SLAVERY.

[illegible]

"It is for the South as well as for the welfare of the country, that I wish to see slavery extinguished. Small farms, free labor, free schools, a free press and open Bibles, free institutions will make the South bloom and blossom as the rose. [illegible] Wherever [illegible] and [illegible] of her moral status and power—when every man can lift up to God unfettered limbs and soul—then the South will start with a bound in emigration and genius, and enterprise will seek her sunny hills and vales; and these shall be the Lookout Mountains upon her deliverance and a race of unending progress to wealth, power and renown (lengthened applause).

[illegible]

[illegible]

We have reason to believe that the great blow has been struck, and that the head, the life of human slavery in the land has been killed. Just as the malefactor on the cross was killed, though he still had life enough to upbraid his Lord, he was judicially dead; he was smitten unto death, death was coming on rapidly through all his members, but yet there was vitality in a measure left, so slavery is dead. It is the observation of God's hand in bringing about this, that gives us not the least of our encouragement and our confidence with regard to what is yet to be in relation to the success of the whole struggle. When the children of Israel came to the Red Sea, Pharaoh behind with his hosts, and the flood before them, no doubt there were multitudes ready to say, "Our deliverance is forever brought to nought." But no doubt there were many more who said, "He that sent the plagues of Egypt, and thus far has so wonderfully delivered us out of the hand of the enemy, he will not desert us here. And so over that sea they went, and through that wilderness they went in safety. So when we see what has been done up to the present time simply by God's hand, without the anticipation of man—an instrument beyond all the wisdom of man at work in our progress thus far, we cannot doubt that God, who has been thus far with us, "a cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night," will still go before us, and all will be well, dark as it may now seem; the "land of promise" and deliverance from bondage will finally be attained.

And part of this confidence arises out of this particular view, that as God maketh the *wrath* of man to praise him, so God makes the *wickedness* of man to praise him, and makes use of the wickedness of man to be his own instrument in accomplishing His great purposes.

Now just as so large a part of the aspects of God's providence in delivering the children of Israel out of Egypt resulted out of the fact that Pharaoh's heart was hardened, so the special manifestation of God's hand in the present aspect of these affairs is precisely that the heart of the oppressor was hardened, and was hardened up to the point of concerting the strongest and the darkest and the most confident of all measures for the riveting of the chains of the oppressed. [illegible] has made use of that very hardening [illegible] determination to strike deeper [illegible] to make more secure its [illegible] hardness of the heart [illegible] of the oppressed [illegible] the special object of [illegible] and seal them forever [illegible] pieces; [illegible] the special object of [illegible] which was [illegible] that it should [illegible] used to open the very [illegible] see a deliverance beyond [illegible] expectations. And for myself, dearly as I love all the other aspects of our country's cause, for all this connected with the oppressed, I do praise and bless the grace and mercy of a covenant God.

And now, brethren, since we have been led thus far, let us have courage to be consistent with what we rejoice in. Let us face the whole proper result of the providence we have been contemplating. Let the enfranchisement of our colored brethren be a complete enfranchisement. Let it not stop in the removal of the shackles, till all are taken away. If the colored man is fit to be a soldier in the full pay and uniform of our citizen armies, standing at least upon an equality of danger and trial with the white man, in defence of our government and its blessings, he is fit to be a citizen under our government in full liberty and privilege. We must boldly face and honestly accept that result. With me it requires no effort. God is leading us to it. All consistency requires it. Our past history is full of inconsistency in this direction. We have never come up to the logical requirements of our Declaration of Independence. God be praised that he is making straight our way. What I said at the beginning, I here repeat, that in these remarks I do not speak [illegible] much comparing [illegible] I speak [illegible] myself. [illegible] will [illegible] as they see fit.

EMANCIPATION IN LOUISIANA.

Correspondence of The N. Y. Times.

NEW ORLEANS, May 12.

YESTERDAY will be forever memorable in the history of Louisiana. Slavery *was then forever abolished in this State.* The Convention which has, for weeks past, been [illegible] on the face of the gigantic [illegible], ending in the [illegible], came at last to a [illegible], and the last few days have [illegible] interest. You will see [illegible] Copperhead [illegible] last desperate [illegible] in this [illegible], and tried to get up all sorts of [illegible] at the [illegible] of the old state of [illegible]. But it was all useless; they might as well have [illegible] prevent the earth from turning [illegible]. The [illegible] passed, by a vote of 70 to [illegible], which are now the foundation [illegible].

[illegible] *save [illegible] except as a [illegible] shall be duly convicted* [illegible].

[illegible] to [illegible] this was also [illegible] and [illegible] The Convention [illegible] had [illegible] as would enable them [illegible] have no [illegible] wheels of progress [illegible] of millions of [illegible] and [illegible] states to be [illegible] justice and the march of [illegible] was fired at noon on the [illegible] event, and few [illegible] fully realized how [illegible] reverberate to the remotest [illegible] world. It is an [illegible] written from New Orleans: NO SLAVE [illegible] TREAD THE SOIL OF LOUISIANA.

NEMO.

The New Orleans [illegible] reports as follows the proceedings [illegible] preliminary to the adoption [illegible] abolishing slavery:

[illegible], the rules were then suspended, to pass the report of the Committee on Emancipation [illegible] third reading.

The previous question was then called and all debate cut off.

The secretary commenced calling the yeas and nays on the adoption of the two first sections of the Emancipation Act, which provide that "slavery and involuntary servitude, except for crime after due conviction, be and are hereby forever abolished in Louisiana; and, second, that the Legislature is forever prohibited from passing any law recognizing property in man."

Mr. Abell wished to explain his vote but as he was branching off into a speech he was called to order by the President, who said his remarks were insulting to the house, and he then voted "no" in a very loud and energetic voice.

Mr. Campbell voted no, no! no! in a thundering tone of voice, adding "In the name of the wronged people of Louisiana I vote no."

Mr. Edwards said: "In the name of the people of Louisiana and freedom, I say yes!"

Mr. Thomas—I have long been in favor of immediate emancipation. When this Convention was called I went before my constituents and told them my sentiments. They elected me by a large majority, and that I may neither violate my own conscience or the pledge I made to my constituents, unlike some others in this body, *I vote yes!*

Mr. Wells—For the good of the white as well as the black races, and for the honor of the flag, I vote yes!

Mr. Montamat explained that he had opposed it on the ground of compensation not being granted, but would vote yes.

On motion, the rules were suspended to allow the President to vote.

President—I vote yes with all my soul.

The following was the result then announced by the Secretary: Yeas, 72; Nays, 13.

In announcing the vote, the President said, "The first and second section of the report having passed their third reading and been adopted, are now a part and parcel of the law of the land."

The announcement was received with great applause and loud cheers.

The House then, on motion, adjourned, and three cheers were given for the Free State of Louisiana.

The Delta, of April 13, reports the proceedings of April 12:

The Convention was called to order by Judge Durell at 12 precisely. The roll was called but as a sufficient number did not answer, the Sergeant-at-Arms was directed to procure the attendance of absent members. After a short recess a quorum was obtained, and the Secretary read the journal of the previous day.

Mr. Bofill asked permission to change his vote on the emancipation question. Permission being granted, [illegible] voted "yes." Mr. Sullivan also asked to change his vote, and he voted "yes." Mr. Campbell said [illegible] vote had been taken separately on the two [illegible] would have voted "yes" on the second [illegible].

[illegible] Mr. Cazabat, of Rapides, was [illegible] vote upon the Emancipation Act, he rose and said:

Mr. President: We have witnessed in this very hall, and [illegible] the [illegible] struggles and the [illegible], thank God! the [illegible] justice and human [illegible] Louisiana stands now forever [illegible] and redeemed by the voice of her people—by the [illegible] of her noble and worthy sons, such as young [illegible], of Rapides, Taliaferro of Catahoula, and Edwards, of Avoyelles. Immortal trio! Heaven bless them! Mr. President, my views in regard to the provisos and amendments offered by the opposition have been duly and fully expressed by my friend, Mr. Fosdick, of New Orleans. I stand, Mr. President, and members of this Convention, upon the platform of immediate and unconditional abolition of slavery. And now, in performance of my duty to my God, to my country and to my fellow-men, I cast and record my vote—"yes!"

Mr. Ennis voted "yes."

A PLEASING INCIDENT IN THE CONVENTION.

From the New Orleans Delta of the [illegible].

One of the most pleasing incidents in the Convention yesterday was [illegible] of their position by young Thos. M. [illegible] Taliaferro. Mr. Wells, a [illegible] is a young, [illegible] and chivalrous [illegible] and bred in [illegible] Governor [illegible] State. The Wells [illegible] only the most [illegible]. It owes [illegible] and Lex[illegible] the [illegible] had among [illegible] war broke [illegible] sent [illegible] Taylor [illegible] Mr. Wells rose [illegible] Convention and [illegible] having a great [illegible] speak [illegible] was [illegible] the Convention. This is a [illegible] his [illegible] Catahoula, it was [illegible] delegates to the [illegible] Convention [illegible] was elected [illegible] Baton Rouge, was on [illegible] the [illegible] confusion that prevailed, and the efforts that were made to drown his voice as he calmly and quietly read it through, and demanded that it should be spread upon the minutes—how he then turned upon that mad, wild body of fanatical men, and like Cassandra at Troy prophesied all the woes and ills that have [illegible] Louisiana, by the introduction of that worst curse within its walls—the ordinance of secession. How true a prophet he was—how well he could foretell the future, we all know [illegible] we regret the rash act, we [illegible] the age [illegible]. It was his son that yesterday [illegible] the Convention and said "I am in favor of immediate emancipation, and of the education of the [illegible]. I was born in the interior of Louisiana, and was never beyond the boundary of the State. I am with Mr. Wells." Comment is unnecessary. Let them be recorded.

LIFE IN THE "VIRTUALLY DEAD."

THE following case now engaging the attention of a court in Tennessee, will show to those who are over-sanguine about the matter, that they can afford to omit no proper legislation which shall definitely set this question at rest. We quote from the Nashville *Union* for March 24:

"A case of [illegible] was brought before Squire Robinson [illegible] it was a suit instituted by Mr. Henry [illegible] & Co., for the recovery of twenty [illegible] one month's wages [illegible] for the services of Albert, a negro [illegible] and employed by [illegible] master, and was employed by [illegible] driver's consent; and [illegible] that he [illegible] the value of the negro's services [illegible] the [illegible].

Now, slavery is said to be 'virtually dead' in Tennessee; a negro who does not choose to remain with his master goes about his business and earns a living for himself, and we have been told by former slave-owners that the most of their class were glad to be rid of the expense and care of the blacks. Yet the moment one of these poor fellows engages in any industry, the master [illegible] down upon his employer and sues him for [illegible]. The result will be that no one will dare to employ a [illegible] and the whole black population [illegible] into pauperism.

But it is not only the blacks [illegible] from this state of things. Under such a system the whole industry of the State will languish, though in order to bring back prosperity to her borders, peaceful and lawful industry must be encouraged by every means. *The Union* says:

"There is no doubt that the controversy involved in the above case will arrest the attention of the people to a great extent [illegible]; *and the result will be paralyzing* [illegible] *the State of Tennessee.* [illegible] do so, for fear they will [illegible] to the master as well as slave [illegible] *for any one without pay.*"

HONORING OUR FATHERS.

IN the debate in the [illegible] Sherman amendment to Mr. Sumner's [illegible] the Fugitive Slave law of 1793 [illegible] 1793 Mr. Foster showed a [illegible] would be called remarkable [illegible] a Chinese. He [illegible] the law [illegible] one, but he was willing [illegible] all the iniquitous features [illegible] Sherman and Oliver Ellsworth [illegible] of the rendition of [illegible] the records of [illegible] although he could not [illegible] of the law [illegible].

"Shall we [illegible] these men that [illegible]. Who are we to [illegible] unknown to our [illegible] willing to insult [illegible] the men of 1793? [illegible] comparison with such men [illegible] Ellsworth, and their comp[illegible]."

Yet Mr. [illegible] requires no more iniquitous [illegible] enacted, an iniquitous [illegible] nor the fathers? We [illegible] consent to a bill for the re[illegible] slaves. We suppose that if the [illegible] would not do it again. Mr. Foster [illegible] experiences of the living in [illegible]. And yet he assumes a [illegible] pronounces such an act as theirs an iniquity. [illegible] moral progress had better go back to the point of sanctioning the righteousness of their acts, or else his acts had better catch up with his morals.—*Cincinnati Gazette.*

WELD'S BIBLE ARGUMENT.*

THE first thought naturally excited by reading the title of this pamphlet, with no author's name, was the strangeness of the fact that a Presbyterian Board had advanced so far as to make open proclamation that the Bible is opposed to slavery; the second was to wonder whether this Board (like the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in 1818, and many subsequent ones), had contrived to unite the theoretical condemnation with the practical toleration of slavery; and the third was, that a careful examination might be necessary (as in the 1818 document) to separate the wheat from the chaff.

The last two ideas, however, were immediately dispelled by a glance at the first two lines of the work. It was plain that this treatise was our old friend, familiar through almost our whole experience of the Anti-Slavery struggle, written by Theodore D. Weld, and originally published in [illegible] Anti-Slavery Magazine [illegible] Is Slavery from [illegible]. Copies of two [illegible] lending, now lie [illegible] we lent, shortly after its publication [illegible] pious and (church-)case-hardened Northern-born slaveholder from Baton Rouge, [illegible] afterwards returned to the North, but keeps his Southern faith, and has always considered Anti-Slavery to be synonymous with Infidelity. In other cases, where the loan of the book fell on good ground, it took root and brought forth good fruit.

This little work, written and published in 1837, contains, as far as the Old Testament is concerned, the substance of an argument elaborated by Dr. Cheever twenty-three years after, in a volume called—"The Scriptures on the Guilt of Slavery." Both are excellent. Both are needed. But the briefer one, now republished, does the work as thoroughly and convincingly as need be. No candid reader can resist the evidence it brings. Its publication now by the Presbyterian Board will introduce it to a new set of readers, and a class who have heretofore been wofully in the dark respecting slavery, led astray by the vicious practice of Southern Presbyterians, and the false doctrine of the whole Presbyterian Church, South and North, Old School and New School. Any advance made by them in regard to condemnation of slavery is plainly due to an impulse from without rather than from within. It is a special effort to avoid being left behind by "the world, the "unregenerate" mass of the community.

The Church could have abolished slavery (or made very large progress towards abolishing it) in any one year of the last quarter-century. It did not choose to work [illegible] at [illegible]. It did choose to hinder the actual workers therein and publish many apologies for slaveholding. A year and a half ago the President of the United States [illegible] church-member, and not pretending any impulse [illegible] military necessity, abolished slavery over three-quarters of the country. Since that time our armies [illegible] very devout or exemplary bodies have [illegible] the remainder of the system of slavery. Now that the peculiar [illegible] seems [illegible] to destruction [illegible] and [illegible] After its [illegible] been [illegible] no doubt the [illegible] Board of Commissioners [illegible] will add their voice to [illegible] A. H. Hall [illegible] In a [illegible] intended to [illegible] that they never held the opposite [illegible].—K. W.—*Liberator.*

* [illegible] SLAVERY [illegible] to be [illegible] P[illegible] —pp. [illegible].

[illegible] POLICY [illegible] BAD POLICY.

[illegible] the present Congress, questions [illegible] have been delayed or [illegible] Mr. Fessenden [illegible] in the session, by [illegible] equal terms. There were [illegible] to delay this [illegible] Mr. [illegible] the Fugitive Slave act [illegible] in it but [illegible] Mr. Trumbull, who [illegible] was proposed [illegible] male citizens of the United States and those who had declared their intentions to become such [illegible] new Territory of Montana, made the cowardly [illegible] that if we went into the Presidential election without discriminating against colored citizens in such cases, and were opposed by Gen. McClellan as a war [illegible], we should be overwhelmingly beaten. This was [illegible] Mr. Trumbull. Later still Mr. Doolittle [illegible] the same question, protested that unless suffrage were limited to white male citizens it would embarrass the approaching Presidential controversy, and somehow hinder the vigorous prosecution of the war.

These are among the more recent expressions of conservative policy by influential Senators, who are friendly to the government. While on other questions they recognize some accepted principles, and aim to square their action by the rule and line of severe statesmanship, in regard to this one they are satisfied to rest their [illegible] on the shifting sands of a low public policy. The war has not [illegible] after all, when [illegible] like these fail to see the unspeakable moral cowardice of shrinking from measures which their own convictions approve, through deference to a kind of public opinion wrong in itself and utterly powerless when it is not upheld by influences precisely like these.

The old prejudice that sprung [illegible]

degradation of the enslaved race lingers in the tone and habit of our recent legislation, like the influence of the fruit of that forbidden tree whose mortal taste brought death into the world and all our woe. It is the false policy of the past, grounded upon fear, struggling to hold its place against the true policy of the present and future, grounded upon justice and the rights of men.

"It is with the greatest difficulty," said Edmund Burke, "that I attempt to separate policy from justice. Justice is itself the great standing policy of civil society—and any eminent departure from it, under any circumstances, lies under the suspicion of being no policy at all." Was ever a concession made to slavery that did not utterly fail? Under every flag of truce slavery made a new disposition of its forces and advanced to a fresh assault. It was successful in every assault but the last one. We retired and compromised step by step, and called that statesmanship. It was suicide. The rebellion ended it. Why attempt to revive it? Slavery itself is sinking with the general wreck. Why keep alive the prejudices which were a part of it? Wherever the army has gone slavery has withered like a scroll—except in Louisiana where Gen. Banks is trying experiments to make it "die of a rose in aromatic pain." Why petr[illegible]ize and prolong that hatred of race, from which it derived no small part of its power? It is worse than no policy. It is bad policy, and nothing but wrong and evil will come of it.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 11, 1864.

TO VOTE OR NOT TO VOTE.

In our last number we alluded to Mr. Phillips's resolution offered to the New England Convention, but not discussed or acted upon, touching the question whether Abolitionists who have taken the ground held by the American Anti-Slavery Society can consistently vote at the coming election, or not? As this resolution was suggested by a passage in a leader of The Standard and was virtually a censure of it, it is proper that we refer to it again. Not that we consider ourselves as obnoxious to any blame for the expression of our opinion as to what the course of certain persons would probably be, without any indication of our ideas as to whether that course would be right or wrong. And very possibly, there was no intention of imputing blame in the premises, but merely the opportunity taken to express Mr. Phillips's dissent from the views which should lead to action at the polls on the part of the Old School Abolitionists. This subject is one eminently proper to be discussed in the columns of this paper, and we hope that it will be thoroughly treated of on both sides. The Society having taken its ground as to this matter long ago, and not having changed it since the recent mutations in our public affairs, it would not become The Standard, as its organ, to controvert that position. There can be no impropriety, however, in our stating the arguments, as we understand them, which induce those who think that the constitutional obstacles between themselves and the ballot-box are at least for the present distress sufficiently put out of the way, to make it possible for them honorably to assist in the next election. We wish it to be understood that we express no editorial opinion on either side of the question, at this time.

It is not an argument in favor of the general intelligence of the general public that the position of the American Society as to voting should be so hard to understand. For nothing can be simpler. At almost every meeting we hold, worthy persons present themselves to express their dissent from us on the question of fighting—as to which we have never expressed any opinion at all—and on that of declining to vote as a means of hastening the Abolition of Slavery. Such strictures would have less the air of impertinence if the true state of the case was understood and they were directed at its real merits. The Anti-Slavery Societies have never taken any ground against war, civil or foreign. As far as we know anything about it, their members hold all sorts of opinions on that subject, but in general not differing from the majority of mankind. They only pledge themselves not to countenance slave-insurrection, not on abstract peace principles, as we understand it, but as a measure of wise expediency. And they did not take up their position as to refraining from voting under the Constitution, because they thought voting wrong in itself, or because they considered that their refusal would promote Abolition. Not at all. They could not take the oath to support the Constitution merely because they did not mean to support it, as to the slave clauses. And what they could not honorably do themselves they could not honorably appoint others to do for them. They could not take an oath, personally or by proxy, which they did not mean to keep. The slaves had no right to ask them to do any such thing. O'Connell and de Rothschild could have entered Parliament when they liked if the one would renounce the Pope and the other make a declaration "on the faith of a Christian." But Catholics and Jews would have been obliged to remain under their disabilities to this day, could their emancipation have been only purchased at this price. Our position was strictly analogous to theirs as to entering office and appointing others to take it for us. One would think it easy enough to comprehend. The chief reason why the American Anti-Slavery Society renounced office was the one just given, that it could only be approached by an oath to do certain pro-slavery things, or not to oppose them. Another, incidental to this, was that the President, for example, and Congress were forbidden to use their power to rid the country of slavery. An oath to support the Constitution was equivalent to an oath of allegiance to slavery, so long the tyrant of the land. It was not the existence of slavery or the law restoring fugitive slaves that barred the door of Congress against an Abolitionist. Had these things been created by legislation, or within the absolute power of legislation—like the established Church of England, for example—there would have been no necessary scruple in the way of his taking part in it. For he [illegible] have proceeded lawfully to use his power to abolish slavery. It was the [illegible] to abstain from doing this, and to submit to whatever had been agreed upon in advance by the framers of the Constitution, that stood in his way. The question suggested by Mr. Phillips's resolution is, whether anything in the recent history of the country has so changed the relations of slavery to the Constitution that the oath to support the one can be taken without engaging to maintain the other. He, we presume, would affirm that no such change has been worked, that the pro-slavery clauses remain in full force, and that as long as a single slave remains to be affected by them, the present principle of the American Society forbids the oath to support it. They who would argue that circumstances alter cases assert that, under the compulsion of the military necessities of the nation, the President has already declared three million and more slaves absolutely free. And they declare, further, that under the same war powers by which he has abolished slavery in the rebel States, he or his successor may abolish it everywhere. An Abolitionist, therefore, may be President of the United States and take the oath to support the Constitution, for, by that Constitution, he can at once abolish slavery wherever it still exists. And, if he may hold the office himself, he may vote for another to do so, during the present condition of affairs. If the President refuse to do what he has the constitutional power to do, it is his responsibility and crime. There is nothing in his oath of office, the military necessity continuing, to hinder him from doing it, and, consequently, to hinder any Abolitionist from voting for him as President.

The same line of argument which has conducted those who hold these opinions to this point as to the Presidency, leads them to a like conclusion as to Congress. An Abolitionist, they maintain, may take the oath preliminary to taking a seat in Congress, [illegible] the same military exigency Con[illegible] powers for the salvation of the country which do not exist in common times of peace. If the President may abolish slavery as a war measure, *a fortiori* the President and both Houses of Congress together may do so. An Abolitionist, therefore, may enter Congress and attack slavery directly and lawfully, which the oath to support the Constitution formerly prevented him from doing. That oath now requires him to do so, since the preservation of the Constitution can be had only through the destruction of slavery. If he can act as a member of Congress, himself, of course, he can vote for another person to represent him. This we apprehend to be the logic by which those Abolitionists who think that they can honorably take part in the approaching canvass and election have come to that conclusion. It is for every one to be fully persuaded in his own mind and to make up his opinion for himself. The letter of the Constitution, we conceive, would not stand in the way of any one who thought that the spirit had departed forth from it. In this case it is the Spirit and not the Letter that killeth. If slavery be actually destroyed, in any way, the letter of the Constitution would be well enough and need hinder no one from swearing to support it. We presume that those who hold the opinion that they may now properly hold office, or vote for others to hold it, which they could not conscientiously do in the days of the Eminent Domain of Slavery, regard this opportunity as one which arises out of the state of affairs. Should a disgraceful settlement round the war, and slavery still be left possessed of indefeasible constitutional rights, we suppose that the old scruple would reattach. While the ill spirit is cast out they will strive to enter in and save the fair house; but if it return and with seven worse devils, which it will bring with it if it come back, they will hold back from serving it as before. We have endeavored to state the case fairly as we suppose it to be in the minds of those who hold it. Our columns are open to the discussion of the question, and we trust that a wise determination will grow out of it.

THE BALTIMORE CONVENTION.

The "National Union Convention" for nominating candidates for President and Vice-President of the United States assembled in the Front Street Theatre in Baltimore on Tuesday, at 12 o'clock, noon. Nearly 600 delegates were present, including those from rebel States and remote Territories. The portions of the building appropriated to spectators were densely crowded, ladies filling the "dress circle." A band from Fort McHenry played a grand overture before the proceedings began.

Ex-Governor Morgan, Chairman of the National Union Executive Committee, appointed at Chicago in 1860, called the Convention to order and made an introductory address, of which the following is the most striking passage:

"It is not my duty nor my purpose to indicate any general plan of action by this Convention, but I trust I may be permitted to say that, in view of the dread realities of the past, and what is passing at this moment, the fact that the bones of our soldiers are bleaching in every State of the Union, and with the knowledge of the further fact that this has all been caused by slavery, the party of which you, gentlemen, are the delegated and only representatives will fall short of accomplishing its great mission, unless among its other resolves it shall declare for such an amendment of the Constitution as will positively prohibit African slavery in the United States (prolonged applause, followed by three cheers)."

Mr. Morgan nominated for temporary President of the Convention the Rev. Robert J. Breckinridge, D.D., of Ky., who, on being conducted to the chair by Mr. King of New York and Mr. Randall of Wisconsin, addressed the Convention at some length. We have room only for an extract or two:

"I am bold to say that, notwithstanding the outcry about our violations of the Constitution, this present living generation and this present Union party are more thoroughly devoted to that Constitution than any generation that has ever lived under it (applause). While I say that, and solemnly believe it, and believe it is capable of the strongest proof, I may also add that it is a great error, which is being propagated in our land, to say that our national life depends merely upon the sustaining of that Constitution. Our fathers made it, and we love it. I intend to maintain it. But if it suits us to change it, we can do so (applause); and when it suits us to change it, we will change it (applause). If it were torn into ten thousand pieces, the nation would be as much a nation as it was before the Constitution was made—a nation always—that declared its independence as a united people, and lived as a united people until now—a nation independent of all particular institutions under which they lived, capable of modeling them precisely as their interests require."

After observing that he would not recite, either for condemnation or approval, the measures by which the government had been brought to its present position in relation to slavery, he went on to say:

"We are prepared to go further than the original Republicans themselves are prepared to go. We are prepared to demand not only that the whole territory of the United States shall not be made slave, but that the General government of the American people shall do one of two things, and it appears to me that there is nothing else that can be done, either to use the whole power of the government, both war power and peace power, to put slavery as nearly as possible back where it was (for although that will be a fearful state of society, it is better than anarchy), or else to use the whole power of the government both of war and peace and all the practical power that the people of the United States will give them to exterminate and extinguish (prolonged applause). I have no hesitation in saying for myself that, if I were a pro-slavery man, if I believed this institution was an ordinance of God and was given to man, I would unhesitatingly join those who demand that the government should put it back where it was; but I am not a pro-slavery man. I never was. I unite myself with those who believe it is contrary to the highest interests of all men and of all government, contrary to the spirit of the Christian religion, and incompatible with the natural rights of men. I join myself with those who say, away with it forever (applause)—and I fervently pray God that the day may come when throughout the whole land every man may be as free as you are, and as capable of enjoying regulated liberty. I will not detain you any longer. . . . . I know very well that the sentiments which I am uttering will cause me great odium in the State in which I was born, which I love, where the bones of two generations of my ancestors and some of my children are, and where, very soon, I shall lay my own. I know very well that my colleagues will incur odium if they indorse what I say; and they, too, know it. But we have put our faces toward the way in which we intend to go, and we will go in it to the end. If we are to perish, we will perish in that way. All I have to say to you is, help us if you can; if you cannot, believe in your hearts that we have died like men (great cheering)."

Prayer was offered by the Rev. Mr. Riley, of the Methodist Church, who did not forget to pray for the abolition of slavery.

The roll of delegates was called, including those from rebel States and distant Territories, but the right of the latter to seats was referred to a Committee on Credentials, composed of one from each loyal State, except Missouri, which, having two sets of delegates, in conflict with each other, was excluded. Committees of one from each State were also named to select permanent officers of the Convention and to prepare resolutions. The Convention, at 3 p.m., adjourned till evening.

In the evening the Committee on the nomination of officers made their report, and the Hon. William Dennison of Ohio was appointed President. Vice-Presidents and Secretaries, one from each loyal State except Missouri, were also chosen.

Gov. Dennison, on being conducted to the chair, made a brief address, in which he said:

"The loyal people of the country have authorized and expect you to renew on their part the pledge of their faith to support the government in the most vigorous prosecution of the war to the complete suppression of the rebellion, regardless of the time or the resources required to that end; and they equally expect and call upon you to declare the cause and support of the rebellion to be slavery, which, as well as for its treasonable offenses against the government as for its incompatibility with the rights of humanity and the permanent peace of the country, must, with the termination of the war, and as much speedier as possible, be made to cease forever in every State and Territory in the Union."

The Committees not being ready to report, Parson Brownlow was called upon for a speech. He responded in a characteristic address, pleading for the admission of the delegation from Tennessee, and for the nomination of Andrew Johnson as the candidate for Vice-President. At the close of his remarks there were loud calls for Garrison, who was known to be present, but he did not respond, and the Convention adjourned to meet on Wednesday, at 9 a.m.

SECOND DAY.

The Committee on Credentials made their report, in substance as follows: 1. That the Union Radical delegation from Missouri be admitted, and the "Claybauks" (Blairites) be excluded. 2. That the delegates from Virginia, Tennessee, Louisiana and Arkansas be admitted to all the privileges of the floor, except that of voting. 3. That the persons presenting themselves as delegates from the State of South Carolina are not entitled to the rights of delegates on the floor. Two minority reports were presented.

An exciting debate followed, which ended in the admission of the Radical delegation from Missouri, by a vote of 440 to 4!; in the admission with full privileges of the delegates from Tennessee, Louisiana, Arkansas, Nebraska, Colorado and Nevada; and in the exclusion of the delegates from South Carolina, Virginia and Florida.

H. J. Raymond, of New York, from the Committee on Resolutions, submitted the following, the reading of which was received with the wildest outbursts of enthusiasm, especially the emancipation and anti-slavery sentiments. The resolutions were adopted by acclamation.

THE PLATFORM.

Resolved, That it is the highest duty of every American citizen to maintain against all their enemies the integrity of the Union and the paramount authority of the Constitution and laws of the United States: and that, laying aside all differences and political opinions, we pledge ourselves as Union men, animated by a common sentiment, and aiming at a common object, to do everything in our power to aid the government in quelling by force of arms the Rebellion now raging against its authority, and in bringing to the punishment due to their crimes the Rebels and traitors arrayed against it (prolonged applause).

Resolved, That we approve the determination of the Government of the United States not to compromise with Rebels, or to offer any terms of peace except such as may be based upon an "unconditional surrender" of their hostility and a return to their just allegiance to the Constitution and laws of the United States; and that we call upon the Government to maintain this position and to prosecute the war with the utmost possible vigor to the complete suppression of the Rebellion, in full reliance upon the self-sacrifices, the patriotism, the heroic valor and the undying devotion of the American people to their country and its free institutions (applause).

Resolved, That as Slavery was the cause and now constitutes the strength of this Rebellion and as it must be always and everywhere hostile to the principles of Republican Government, justice and the national safety demand its utter and complete extirpation from the soil of the Republic (applause), and that we uphold and maintain the acts and proclamations by which the Government, in its own defence, has aimed a death-blow at this gigantic evil. We are in favor, furthermore, of such an amendment to the Constitution, to be made by the people in conformity with its provisions, as shall terminate and forever prohibit the existence of Slavery within the limits or the jurisdiction of the United States (applause).

Resolved, That the thanks of the American people are due to the soldiers and sailors of the army and the navy (applause) who have periled their lives in defence of their country, and in vindication of the honor of the Flag; that the nation owes to them some permanent recognition of their patriotism and their valor, and ample and permanent provision for those of their survivors who have received disabling and honorable wounds in the service of the country; and that the memories of those who have fallen in its defence shall be held in grateful and everlasting remembrance [loud applause].

Resolved, That we approve and applaud the practical wisdom, the unselfish patriotism and unswerving fidelity to the Constitution and the principles of American Liberty with which Abraham Lincoln has discharged, under circumstances of unparalleled difficulty, the great duties and responsibilities of the Presidential office; that we approve and indorse, as demanded by the emergency and essential to the preservation of the nation, and as within the Constitution, the measures and acts which he has adopted to defend the nation against its open and secret foes; that we approve especially the Proclamation of Emancipation, and the employment as Union soldiers of men heretofore held in Slavery [applause]; and that we have full confidence in his determination to carry these and all other constitutional measures essential to the salvation of the country into full and complete effect.

Resolved, That we deem it essential to the general welfare that harmony should prevail in the National councils, and we regard as worthy of public confidence and official trust those only who cordially indorse the principles proclaimed in these resolutions, and which should characterize the administration of the government (applause).

Resolved, That the government owes to all men employed in its armies, without regard to distinction of color, the full protection of the laws of war (applause), and that any violations of these laws or of the usages of civilized nations in the time of war by the Rebels now in arms should be made the subject of full and prompt redress (prolonged applause).

Resolved, That the foreign immigration which in the past has added so much to the wealth and development of resources and increase of power to this nation, the asylum of the oppressed of all nations, should be fostered and encouraged by a liberal and just policy.

Resolved, That we are in favor of the speedy construction of the railroad to the Pacific.

Resolved, That the national faith pledged for the redemption of the public debt must be kept inviolate, and that for this purpose we recommend economy and rigid responsibility in the public expenditures, and a vigorous and just system of taxation; that it is the duty of any loyal State to sustain the credit and promote the use of the national currency (applause).

Resolved, That we approve the position taken by the government that the people of the United States can never regard with indifference the attempt of any European Power to overthrow by force or to supplant by fraud the institutions of any republican government on the Western Continent (prolonged applause), and that they will view with extreme jealousy, as menacing to the peace and independence of this our country, the efforts of any such Power to obtain new footholds for monarchical governments, sustained by a foreign military force in near proximity to the United States (long-continued applause).

The Resolutions having been unanimously adopted, the Convention, after a brief discussion as to the way of taking the vote, proceeded to ballot for a candidate for President, with the following result:

For Mr. Lincoln—Maine, 14; New Hampshire, 10; Vermont, 10; Massachusetts, 24; Rhode Island, 8; Connecticut, 12; New York, 66; New Jersey, 14; Pennsylvania, 52; Delaware, 6; Maryland, 14; Louisiana, 14; Arkansas, 10; Tennessee, 15; Kentucky, 22; Ohio, 42; Indiana, 26; Illinois, 32; Michigan, 16; Wisconsin, 16; Iowa, 16; Minnesota, 8; California, 10; Oregon, 6; West Virginia, [illegible]; Kansas, 6; Nebraska, 6; Colorado, 6; Nevada, 6—Total, 497.

For Gen. Grant—Missouri, 22.

Mr. Hume of Mo. (acting, doubtless, for his colleagues as well as himself) moved that the vote be declared unanimous. The enthusiasm was indescribable, the whole Convention being on their feet shouting, and the band playing "Hail Columbia."

Andrew Johnson of Tennessee, by a large majority (afterwards made unanimous), was nominated for Vice-President.

The Convention, after chosing a National Committee to serve during the next four years, adjourned without day.

THE WORK AND THE WEAPONS OF ABOLITIONISTS.

At a special meeting of the Executive Committee of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society, held June 1st, 1864, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted.

1. Resolved, That our confidence in the weapons by which the American Anti-Slavery Society and its Auxiliaries have attempted the overthrow of American slavery is confirmed by the results of our moral warfare of the last thirty years; and that, contemplating the peculiar adaptation of spiritual weapons to the destruction of moral evil, we clearly perceive that in the use of these only the great strength of our organization lies; and, consequently, that it is of the utmost importance to the cause which we have espoused, that we continue to wield them faithfully, and to rely upon them, until that cause shall be completely triumphant.

2. Resolved, That though diversities of opinion among Abolitionists, upon the various political questions of the times, are natural and inevitable, these do not touch the essential principles of our enterprise, and, consequently, cannot divide its true friends; and, that, while we erect no political platform, we regard it as the imperative duty of our Anti-Slavery Associations to watch with undiminished vigilance, and criticize with unswerving justice, every political party and leader and measure, in all their relations to the cause of the slave's emancipation.

JAMES MOTT, Chairman.

BENJAMIN C. BACON, Secretary.

Jeff. Davis and his Mulatto Children.—Abolitionists are constantly accused in Copperhead papers of trying to bring about an amalgamation of whites and blacks; but those papers are very careful to conceal from their [illegible] in the following extract of a letter from an officer of the Army to a Senator, in Washington:

"While at Vicksburg, I resided opposite to a house belonging to a negro man who once belonged to Joe Davis, a brother of Jeff. Learning this I happened one day to think that he perhaps would know something about the truth of a story told in the London *Times*, that there was a son of Jeff. Davis, the mother of whom was a slave woman, in our navy. The next time that I met the man I asked him if he had ever known Maria, who had belonged to Jeff. Davis, and was the mother of some of his children? He replied that he had not known Maria, but that he knew his Massa Joe Davis's Eliza, who was the mother of some of Massa Jeff's children. I then inquired if she had a son in the navy. He replied that she had—he knew him—they called him Purser Davis. He said that Eliza was down the river some thirty miles, at work on a plantation. The next day, as I was walking down street, I met the man, who was driving his mule team, and he stopped to tell me that Eliza had returned. A few moments afterwards he came back, and pointing to one of two women who came walking along, he said she was the one of whom he had been talking. When she came up, I stopped her, and inquired whether she had not a son who would like to go North. She replied yes, and added that she would like to go too. I told her that I only wanted a lad. She said that her son had gone up the Red river on board the gunboat Carondelet, but that when he returned she would be pleased to have him go. 'Well,' said I, 'some say that Jeff. Davis is your son's father—do you suppose it's so?' 'Suppose!' she exclaimed with offended pride, 'I's no right to suppose what I knows am certain so. Massa Jeff. was the father of five of my children, but they are all dead but that boy, and then I had two that he wasn't the father of. There's no suppose about it.' Perhaps if the boy gets back safe on the Carondelet, you may see him in Boston some of these days."

Of course this case is one of thousands of the same character. In the late earnest movement in favor of freedom in Western Virginia, which culminated in the death of slavery there, the most violent opposer to the new order of things was U. S. Senator John S. Carlile. In regard to this gentleman, the Parkersburg Va. *Gazette* of a late date says:

"We did not know last week for what Senator John S. Carlile came here and was so still about on Sunday week. We know now. He had a mulatto woman and child here—the latter his own. He took them with him on Monday morning. This is an example of practical '*miscegenation*' which is by no means isolated in its character."

LETTER FROM WENDELL PHILLIPS, ESQ.

BOSTON, May 27, 1864.

Dear Sir: I deeply regret that it is out of my power to attend the Cleveland Convention. Allow me to suggest one or two things which I hoped to urge on its attention.

Without denying what the friends of the Administration claim—that it has done something toward crushing the rebellion—my charge against it is that it has not done half that it should and could have done toward that end, had it used the means in its hands, with an earnest and single purpose to close the strife thoroughly and forever. It has thought more of conciliating rebels than of subduing them. It has avowedly forborne the use of lawful and efficient means (to wit, the abolition of slavery), until it was thought indispensable, and even then has used it in a half-hearted, halting way, wishing to save the feelings of rebels. We had three tools with which to crush the rebellion—men, money, and the emancipation of the negro. We were warned to be quick and sharp in the use of these, because every year the war lasted hardened the South from a Rebellion into a Nation, and doubled the danger of foreign interference. Slavery has been our great trouble in the past, and, as every man saw, was our great danger in the future. Statesmanship said, therefore, Seize at once the God given opportunity to end it, at the same time that you, in the quickest, shortest and cheapest manner, annihilate the rebellion.

For three years, the Administration has lavished money without stint, and drenched the land in blood, and it has not even yet thoroughly and heartily struck the slave system. Confessing that the use of this means is indispensable, the Administration has used it just enough to irritate the rebels; and not enough to save the State. In sixty days after the rebellion broke out, the Administration suspended *Habeas Corpus*, on the plea of military necessity—justly. For three years it has poured out the treasure and blood of the country like water. Meanwhile, slavery was too sacred to be used; that was saved, lest the feelings of rebels should be hurt. The Administration weighed treasure, blood and civil liberty against slavery, and, up to the present moment, has decided to exhaust them all before it uses *freedom*, heartily, as a means of battle.

Mr. Lincoln's friends tell us that if he is reëlected, he is reëlected to pursue the same policy and obey the same Cabinet. What will be the result of another four years of such policy? Unless the South is recognized, the war will continue; the taxation needed to sustain our immense debt, doubled by that time, will grind the laboring men of the North down to the level of the pauper labor of Europe; and we shall have a government accustomed to despotic power for eight years—a fearful peril to Democratic institutions.

Mr. Lincoln's model of reconstruction is the experiment in Louisiana, which puts all power into the hands of the unchanged white race, soured by defeat, hating the laboring class, plotting constantly for aristocratic institutions. To reconstruct the rebel States on that model is only continuing the war in the Senate chamber after we have closed it in the field. Such reconstruction, leaving the South with its labor and capital at war, puts the whole payment of the debt on the industrious North, and in that way it will hang on us for a century. Such reconstruction makes the freedom of the negro a sham, and perpetuates slavery under a softer name. Such reconstruction, leaving the seeds of discontent and division in the South in places of power, tempts and facilitates another rebellion, at the instigation or with the aid of French Mexico. Such reconstruction dooms us to a second or third-rate place among nations, and provokes foreign insult and aggression.

There is no plan of reconstruction possible within twenty years, unless we admit the black to citizenship and the ballot, and use him, with the white, as the basis of States. There is not in the rebel States sufficient white basis to build on. If we refuse this method, we must subdue the South and hold it as territory until this generation of white men has passed away, and their sons, with other feelings, have taken their places, and Northern capital, energy and immigration have forced their way into the South. Should we adopt that plan, and wait for those changes, twenty years must elapse before we can venture to rebuild States. Meanwhile, a large and expensive army, and the use of despotic power by a government holding half its territory and citizens as subjects, make every thoughtful man tremble for the fate of free government. A quick and thorough reorganization of States, on a Democratic basis, every men and race equal before the law, is the only sure way to save the Union. I urge it not for the black man's sake alone, but for ours—for the nation's sake.

Against such recognition of the blacks, Mr. Lincoln stands pledged by prejudice and avowal. Men say, if we elect him, he may change his views. Possibly. But three years has been a long time for a man's education in such hours as these. The nation cannot afford more. At any rate, the Constitution gives us this Summer an opportunity to make President a man fully educated. I prefer that course.

The Administration, therefore, I regard as a civil and military failure, and its avowed policy ruinous to the North in every point of view. Mr. Lincoln may wish the end—peace and freedom—but he is wholly unwilling to use the means which can secure that end. If Mr. Lincoln is reëlected, I do not expect to see the Union reconstructed in my day, unless on terms more disastrous to liberty than even Disunion would be. If I turn to Gen. Fremont, I see a man whose first act was to use the freedom of the negro as his weapon. I see one whose thorough loyalty to democratic institutions, without regard to race—whose earnest and decisive character, whose clear-sighted statesmanship, and rare military ability, justify my confidence that in his hands all will be done to save the State that foresight, skill, decision and statesmanship can do.

I think the Convention should incorporate in its platform the demand for an amendment of the Constitution, prohibiting slavery everywhere within the Republic, and forbidding the States to make any distinction among their citizens, on account of color or race. I think it should demand a reconstruction of States as speedily as possible, on the basis of every loyal man, white or black, sharing the land and the ballot.

But if some of these points are not covered, I shall still support its action with all my heart, if it puts the name of Fremont or Butler on its flag. Fremont is my first choice, but I can support either of them; and this is an hour of such peril to the Republic, that I think men should surrender all party and personal pertinacity and support any man able and willing to save the State.

If the Baltimore Convention shall nominate Mr. Lincoln, then I hope we shall fling our candidate's name, the long-honored one of J. C. Fremont, to the breeze, and appeal to the patriotism and common sense of the people to save us from another such three years as we have seen. If, on the contrary, the Baltimore Convention shall give us the name of any man whom the radicals of the loyal States can trust, I hope we shall be able to arrange some plan which will unite all on a common basis, and carry our principles into the government.

Wishing you all success, and prepared to second your efforts to remove this Administration,

I am, yours, etc., WENDELL PHILLIPS.

EDWARD GILBERT, Esq., New-York.

AN ACKNOWLEDGMENT.

To the Editor of The National Anti-Slavery Standard.

The Ladies of the Freedmen and Soldiers' Relief Association desire, through The Standard, to acknowledge the receipt of $112 from European societies. We return sincere thanks to the Edinburgh Anti-Slavery, the Aberdeen Ladies' and Sheffield Anti-Slavery Societies for their generous donations to the Freedmen.

It is most gratifying to us to know that British hearts are moved and British hands outstretched to aid the poor sufferers so long manacled and crushed.

Our warmest thanks are tendered Frederick Douglass, Esq., for his sympathy and assistance. Through his influence we have gained trans-Atlantic friends. We thank him most heartily for his words of cheer and for his timely aid.

Permit me, sir, on behalf of the Freedmen, to tender to all the friends who have aided us our sincere thanks.

EMMA V. BROWN, Corresponding Secretary.

Washington, June 4th, 1864.

WOMAN AND POLITICS.

E. CADY STANTON TO MRS. DALL.

My Dear Friend: I regret that any misapprehension on your part of the nature and purposes of the Women's National League should have caused you the confusion your letter manifests. In your invidious insinuation of a concealed purpose, you reveal your man of straw alone vulnerable to your attack. The *call* for the Convention was legitimately open for a public reply; the League is in no way responsible for my private letter.

Your paradoxical letter, of fragmentary thoughts, thrown together without logic or arrangement, I have pondered as I would a Chinese puzzle, and, after adjusting and readjusting its conflicting assertions, the following propositions are discernible:

1. You deny woman's political rights; she may "*interest* herself in national questions," but she may not "dictate."

2. Her sphere is morals; she may not descend into vulgar politics.

3. She is ignorant of the science of government; wholly incompetent to judge of the political fitness of a tried man for the Presidency, while, with the accuracy of a thermometer, she measures his moral altitude the moment he enters her presence.

4. She must not enter the political arena until invited; "an unauthorized interference never produces any good results."

5. Our Presidents are made by the direct fiat of Heaven, not like Moses, to *lead* the people, but like the golden calf of the Israelites, to be adored and borne on our shoulders, wherever the popular tide may flow.

6. You say Mr. Garrison's stand-point, for the last thirty years, has not been the best one for sound political judgment of men and measures.

Now, on all these points I take issue with you, and gladly embrace this opportunity to reassert rights I had supposed settled, long ago, in all "advanced" minds.

1. I believe the best interests of the nation demand the united, equal power and influence of man and woman in politics, religion and social life; and woman will never interest herself in national questions without feeling that she has a right to be heard. Experience and reason alike prove that the right to dictate—aside from years and wisdom—belongs not to those, only, who are crowned with the glory of manhood.

2. For the moral position of the Women's National League I refer you to our Report and Resolutions, in which you will find that we, so far from descending into an "electioneering caucus" or political cabal, have, by the enunciation of principles, lifted politics into the sphere of morals and religion. Our League, formed one year ago, pledging its members "loyal to freedom," with the avowed object of "educating the nation into the idea of a true republic," is the first and only organization of women for the express purpose of influencing politics. In petitioning Congress for an act of Emancipation, we began with the a, b, c of human rights, and have thus made ourselves a power for freedom with the people and their representatives.

We differ from you, in that, as we near the point of reconstruction, we see reason for renewed effort in the "coming Presidential campaign." However faithful you may have been in the past, we, with the mass of Northern women, must mourn our want of vigilance, must plead guilty to the charge that we have not guarded the tree of liberty with the care and earnestness they of the South have shown for their "peculiar institution."

The fact that a careful housewife has always guarded against fire and candles and sparks, is certainly no reason why she should not "sound a special reveille" when her house is in flames.

3. The great difficulties in the exercise of civil power, not yet surmounted by man even, after years of experience, should, you say, make woman pause before "assuming responsibilities God has not conferred." To my mind, these difficulties are traceable, not to the intricacy of the problem of government—for justice is a simple thing—but to the blindness of man, in not seeing that freedom and equality are the corner-stones of all just and stable government. Perchance, with woman's help, he might more easily have unravelled the tangled skein that has so sorely perplexed him, unaided and alone.

As to woman's ignorance of the science of government, we Americans are proverbial for our knowledge of politics and its machinery. When the wife of old John Adams rebuked him for the fatal compromises with slavery, made in the Constitutional Convention, did she not show the higher statesmanship? In the exciting campaign of "Tippecanoe and Tyler too," who so firmly and eloquently held up the standard of freedom, who so thoroughly understood the momentous issues of that hour as Abby Kelley?—a name I ever speak with reverence.

Have not women for the last twenty years taught our legislators higher laws of justice and compelled them to clean their books of many barbarous statutes? What man did more than Anna Dickinson to save the election in Connecticut and Pennsylvania? The best word yet spoken on the vexed question of "retaliation" is by a Connecticut woman, in *The Independent* of May 5th.

In dooming women to "modest silence," then commanding her to arraign her rulers before the judgment seat of the people, by frequent moral rebukes, the "stern stand and deliver," your logic is like that of the fond mother who bade her son never go near the river until he had learned to swim. And your cruelty is only surpassed by the rude men in "Titus Andronicus, who cut out the tongue and cut off the hands of the royal daughter, then bade her "go call for water and wash her hands."

In judging of our [illegible], I am at a loss to know by what plummet you sound their moral depths. You praise President Lincoln, who holds millions of human beings in slavery with its wholesale licentiousness and concubinage and denies the right of suffrage to free black citizens, while you spurn the name of Gen. Butler whose policy is freedom and the [illegible] recognition of the manhood of the slave.

Remember, in the black man we are settling the foundation principles of morals and governments. It is not a question merely what we shall do with four million Africans; but what are the rights of man?

President Lincoln's proclamations are a dead letter unless backed up by the immortal declaration, "All men are created equal," and our revolution to no purpose unless in the reconstruction we realize that sublime utterance of the Fathers.

4. What progress should we have made in government, if men had always waited for an invitation from those in power to take their rights and privileges? Would there have been a House of Commons in the English Parliament if the people had waited for the Lords to inaugurate the movement? Would our Revolutionary Fathers ever have founded a Republic and repudiated the monarch and his throne, had they waited for the permission of George the III.? Did Massachusetts or New York propose to give woman her rights of property, children and wages, before we ourselves made the demand? "An aristocracy never seeks to share its privileges."

5. If "through the uncertainties of politicians and the quarrels of demagogues, God led Abraham Lincoln to the Executive chair," to clog the wheels of civilization—a dead weight on the people for education, at the very moment they needed "a pillar of light to go before them in the wilderness," who shall say that Pierce and Buchanan were not given us for the same purpose, and thus involve God in the absurdity of changing his politics once in four years, and dividing the Heavenly Hosts into Republicans and Democrats? To my mind, thus to bring God and the Angels down into the muddy pool of politics would be far worse then for the daughters of the pilgrims, "unauthorized," even, to share all the dangers and difficulties of this earthly sphere. The day has past for making Providence the scape goat for all our ignorance and folly. Our duty is to study the immutable principles of right, and bring ourselves and the nation into line with them. We do not propose to leave the next Presidency to chance or guess, or wire-pullers, under the very shadow of Executive patronage; but that the people, in mass Convention, shall decide for themselves whom they will have of the men already tried. We do not want an unknown "man, pledged to nobody and nothing"—neither do we want one pledged to slavery, as President Lincoln has ever been. Had I been asked who should be President in 1860, I would have said William H. Seward. Gen. Fremont was not thought of in that campaign, though the people's candidate in 1856. The emergencies of the war have placed Gen. Fremont and Gen. Butler before the nation, admired for their military genius, their statesmanship, executive ability, and their broad views of human rights.

If, by chance, Gen. Butler should be our next President, your position would be a very painful one, for four long years you would not be able to write or speak the name of the Executive of the nation. By such Providence, perhaps, you might "patiently" learn the lesson of the *one term principle*.

6. They who, outside of the excitement and competition of a game, calmly watch the moves and chances, see the results more clearly than they who play. In the conventions of politicians, or the speeches of acknowledged statesmen, either of our day or the past, where do you find deeper, broader, higher principles of policy and government, than have been uniformly enunciated in our Anti-Slavery Conventions for the last thirty years? They have been the nation's school, where men and measures have been candidly and severely criticized, and where our most liberal Christians, clearest logicians, earnest orators and wisest statesmen have taken their best lessons for the practical work of life. Who can say that Wendell Phillips, the advance man of this hour would not be a safer pilot at the helm of government than Thurlow Weed, the American Talleyrand, skilled as he is in the arts of diplomacy and management?

ELIZABETH CADY STANTON.

Philadelphia Correspondence.

PHILADELPHIA, June [illegible], 1864.

In my letter to-day I shall turn aside from [illegible] matters of State and questions of doubtful disputation, and confine myself to topics which afford no occasion for disagreement. As your correspondent for Philadelphia, I fall back upon my proper function, which is to keep you advised of whatever may be transpiring in this region of interest to your readers.

The Philadelphians are at this moment, and have been for months, as busy as bees in various works of progressive and reformatory industry. Everybody that is anybody is taking part in the great Revolution and its measures on a large scale, destructive and constructive, to bring it to a successful issue, are in process of execution. Recruiting agencies, Sanitary Commissions and Freedmen's Relief Associations are the order of the day, and no one, not a Copperhead, has a moment of time or a dollar of money to spare from their demands. The two grand Commissions for the relief of the sick and wounded, the "Sanitary" and "Christian," are striving with generous rivalry which can do the most for the country and her brave defenders. The people pour out their money like water for the support of both, and their columns of donations foot up with figures of almost fabulous magnitude. The Sanitary Commission this week opens its great Fair. It is got up on a scale and in a style meant to eclipse all its predecessors in other parts of the country.

But I own to an interest not more sincere, but deeper in the two other movements alluded to; the one for the recruitment of black soldiers and the other for the relief and elevation of colored freedmen. These two movements illustrate the reciprocal and onward processes of the revolution; one pulls down, the other builds up; one destroys, the other recreates.

A year ago Philadelphia had done nothing practically toward the enlistment of black troops. There had been much discussion and certain earnest men had contended strongly for the policy; but no overt steps had been taken in that direction. At length a member of the Union League—who was also a member of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society—insisted at one of these meetings that the time had come for action, and announced that a committee was about to be formed to start the movement. A member of the League—not a member of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society—stood ready to take the initiative, and the ball was at once put in motion. This gentleman went to work, and the result was, in a few days, first a memorial to the Secretary of War asking for authority to raise three regiments of colored infantry, and second, the formation of a Supervisory Committee, to have in charge the business of their recruitment. The memorial was numerously signed by leading men of the city, and its request was granted; the Supervisory Committee was made up from the anti-slavery *elite* of the League, with the addition of several persons who were not members of that body. Its chairman was and is the gentleman above alluded to, Thomas Webster, Esq.—the master spirit of the whole movement.

It is not yet a year since that Committee was formed, yet it has—instrumentally—put into the field ten full regiments—a very respectable army—of as fine looking soldiers as ever entered the lists of battle. Seven of these regiments were recruited from Pennsylvania and States adjacent, and were organized and officered at Camp William Penn; the other three were raised in Maryland and there trained and put in condition for service. The value of these troops is no longer a matter of question. The deeds done at Wagner and Olustee, and the humiliation of the haughty Fitzhugh Lee at Wilson's Landing are facts which shut the mouths of all gainsayers. In raising these regiments the Supervisory Committee have effected a marvellous change in public sentiment. Their tracts, newspaper articles, pictorial representations, public meetings, etc., etc., have done much in overcoming prejudice and establishing in the community a new respect for the rights of the black man. The Committee have expended in these publications, ect., $7,688 14.

In addition to these regiments and this change of public sentiment the Committee have given to the country a Free Military School; a contribution which in the present exigencies of the service, proves to be a great advantage. This school has been established to meet a pressing and imperative want; that of a sufficient number of qualified officers to command in the black regiments. The measure was advised by Gen. Casey, head of the Examining Board at Washington, and has since received the approval of the Secretary of War.

The "Free Military School for Applicants for Command in Colored Regiments," which has been in existence less than six months, has on its roll of candidates for admission the names of three thousand and ninety-two (3,092) persons, and on its list of pupils, the names of eight hundred and forty (840) who have received its benefits. It has four professors and assistant professors, and at present has in its catalogue the names of 117 students in actual attendance. It has sent before the Board at Washington for examination, two hundred and twenty-nine (229) candidates, all but twelve of whom have passed. These have been assigned to various grades of command from Second Lieutenant to Colonel; not a few of them are at this moment using the [illegible]. It may be proper to say that most of the pupils of the school are from the army of the Potomac and have seen service.

A writer in the Washington Daily *Chronicle*, describing a visit paid by him to the school and to the headquarters of the Committee—both of which are under the same roof—has a paragraph which shows the moral as well as belligerent bearing of the recruiting movement, is as follows:

"We next visited the Committee rooms proper, and were shown, among other interesting things, several different editions of huge placards, revealing the diabolism of slavery and secession, which had been printed and published in England by our friends there, for extensive circulation among the working people of that country. The infernal atrocities of the villany of the wickedness of the rebellion, the villany of its leaders, the craft and hypocrisy of its aiders and abettors here and in England, were powerfully set forth. We were not before aware of the sharpness of the fight over us and *for us* which the real people of Great Britain had to wage against their haughty aristocracy of blood and breeding, in close alliance with our own lustful lords of the lash."

As mention has been made of the efficiency of Mr. Webster, Chairman of the Supervisory Committee, it ought to be added that next to him in usefulness should be placed Mr. Robert R. Corson, its general Agent. To Mr. Corson's untiring zeal, wise discretion, exhaustless good nature and indefatigable industry, the enterprise is indebted beyond its power to pay.

Before leaving this subject of the Supervisory Committee, I desire to quote a passage from the proceedings of their last meeting. It relates to the lamented death of our townsman, Robert B. Forten, and is as follows:

At a meeting of the Supervisory Committee for the Recruitment of Colored Troops, held at their headquarters, No. 1210 Chestnut street, Philadelphia, on the 30th of May, 1864, the following resolution, etc., was unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That in addition to the notice already taken of